



REMARKS

The instant amendment is being made according to the permitted revised format under 37 C.F.R. 1.112.

Claims 3 and 5 have been cancelled. Claims 1-2, 4 and 6-28 remain for examination.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. This claim has now been cancelled, thus removing the basis for the rejection.

Claims 1-2 and 4-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Cyr (6,223,055) in view of Bojeryd (5,771,465). Further, claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Cyr in view of Bojeryd and further in view of Kim (5,375,162).

The examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Neither the primary nor secondary references cited by the examiner disclose nor make obvious applicant's invention and in particular limitation in which the plurality of extension numbers each have different lines set for the plurality of extension numbers. In order to make this limitation more clear, applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite that the plurality of mobile stations each have a plurality of extension numbers and each of the extension numbers has a different line key set for the plurality of extension numbers respectively. The line keys are illustrated in applicant's Figure 2 as element 12. The sole remaining independent claim 4 has similarly been amended.

It is apparent that neither Cyr nor Bojeryd disclose applicant's invention. In the rejection of claim 7, the examiner referred to Figure 8 in column 7, lines 50-63 of Bojeryd presumably for a showing of making a call setup using a key pad instead of a key button. However, the examiner's comment misses the mark. Applicant's invention recites that the plurality of mobile stations each have a plurality of extension numbers and each of these extension numbers has a different line key set for the plurality of extension numbers. Thus, as shown in applicant's Figure 2, plural line keys are part of each mobile telephone and each such line key is set to a different extension number. None of the references taken either singly or in combination teach this very important aspect of applicant's invention.

RECEIVED

APR 23 2003

Technology Center 2600



Atty. Dkt. No. 040373-0280

By way of a separate letter attached hereto, applicant proposes drawing changes to Figures 1 and 6. With the examiner's approval the formal drawings will be so modified.

The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 15, 2003

By

FOLEY & LARDNER
Washington Harbor
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257

RECEIVED
APR 23 2003
Technology Center 2600